

Draft Action/Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Water Conservation Advisory Committee Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
Thursday, May 13, 2010 – 10:30 a.m.

1. Verification of Notice, Call to Order

Chairman MacFarlane called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

Committee Members: Chairman Anita MacFarlane, Vice Chairman Brent Bitz and Committee Members Mark Fenech – Oak Creek Water Company, Ken Jepson, Keith Self – Arizona Water Company, and Cindy Rovey. Marybeth Carlile - excused.

Staff: Beth Escobar, Audree Juhlin, Donna Puckett and Mike Raber

2. Committee and Staff announcements

Chairman MacFarlane welcomed the Committee's new member Ken Jepson and thanked him for helping at Water Day.

3. Approval of the April 8, 2010 minutes

The Chairman indicated this item is for the approval of the April 8, 2010 minutes.

MOTION: Mark Fenech moved to approve. Cindy Rovey seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. (Carlile excused)

4. Public Forum for items not listed on the agenda--limit of three minutes per presentation (Note: the Committee may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public)

The Chairman opened the public forum and having no public present, closed the public forum.

5. Discussion/update on Committee member assignments and meetings attended

Vice Chairman Bitz indicated that WEDLU's report was given at the City Council meeting Tuesday night, after two years of deliberations. Since the City Council is changing, the presentation was intended to be informative for both the Council and members of the Council-Elect that were present, so it was agendaized only to provide a recommendation. The result was to hopefully have a work session with the new Council in June. Regarding the content, the City is facing a shortfall in its capacity to deal with the anticipated future volume of effluent and the recommendation was likely the combination of direct injection and recharge onsite combined with constructed wetlands, but there was not enough data available to be able to make a firm recommendation, because it wasn't clear as to how much effluent disposal capacity each option would provide and any solution is going to cost several million dollars.

The recommendation was Phase I of constructed wetlands, which would be to build a permanent wetlands with a small weather station on the existing rapid infiltration basin areas to test depths of constructed wetlands, etc., and measure the amount of effluent disposed in that context, for a relatively modest amount of money of somewhat over \$100,000. It would probably take 12 to 18 months, and separately from that, the onsite injection studies indicate that there is a significant potential opportunity to inject effluent onsite. The studies showed there are some cavities under the wetlands plant area that may be able to accept effluent, but we need to do some test wells to

ascertain the volume of effluent that can be injected at any one time or if mounding is going to occur, and whether or not the water would be stored or go into an aquifer and flow away, and that would require a much larger capital commitment, because any injection would require the upgrade of the water from B+ to A+, which would cost between \$1 million and \$1.8 million, plus about \$1 million in testing, etc. Those investigations would take 2 to 2½ years to complete, and hopefully, the task force would work with the City Council over the next couple of months to assist them in determining their recommendation. Once they make a decision, it is possible that the task force would be disbanded. Additionally, part of the original mandate of the Council was to consider land use options should there be surplus lands, but the task force decided it was impossible to address that, because we don't know how much land will be available, if any. If we went for 100% wetlands, it is possible we would use the entire area and possibly go into Forest Service land, but if it ended up 100% injection, large chunks of the land might be available, so that part was on hold.

No legal action was taken.

6. Discussion/possible action regarding the April 29, 2010 Water Wise Education Event at West Sedona School

Cindy Rovey thanked everyone for making it a very successful day, but it was cold. Cindy circulated some notes written by the students and one student drew part of Mark Fenech's and Brent Bitz's presentation. These came from Mrs. Scott, and when asked if she could suggest any changes, she said no, you have tweaked it enough and it is excellent. There was just one area that we may need to put a little more life into, but Sedona Recycles did an excellent job. Unfortunately, Linda Crawford that worked with us is one that was laid off. Cindy thanked everyone for their help.

Chairman MacFarlane agreed that it went very well and Marybeth Carlile also thought it went very well. Cindy Rovey indicated that next year, the 4th, 5th and 6th grades will be in a building that is presently being constructed, so it will be a new venue, and there is an amphitheater area to the east of the building we were in, and that was where we were going to start had the weather been cooperative, but we felt that having them not move so far between stations would help; there was no time in changing from one station to the other.

Vice Chairman Bitz indicated he thought being inside was actually pretty good and caused them to focus in the corridors. Chairman MacFarlane expressed her thanks to everyone; it went well and everything moved well, even though we had to hurry, because of the change in getting out of the cafeteria sooner. The kids were great, and we should look forward to a good day next year.

No legal action was taken.

7. Discussion/update regarding updating the Sedona Community Plan Water Element

Mike Raber indicated that he has had several conversations with Keith Self in trying to separate out the Village of Oak Creek numbers, in terms of residential and total. Once he got that, he was able to look at what the difference was in the total housing units, and he took out our estimate of vacant homes, and then we had a discrepancy of around 530 units, so Keith checked and verified that those are multiple units served by one meter, so we were able to get that just about down to the wire, and he is pretty satisfied that the numbers are good, in terms of the number of units. We may want to retable this, because he is combining that with Oak Creek Water to see what the total is, and he assumes there may be a few like that in those numbers as well, so we might want to retable this, so we can total all of that and get the total number of customers and units, and then put in a footnote

that describes why it is different than the total elsewhere in the plan. He is pleased with how that ended up and we are using the same percentage for projections, so that should all track the same. The remaining big question was what the Village of Oak Creek's gallons/day usage was, to see if that was skewing our 346 mpd. Keith indicated that just today, he provided the number of 325 mpd and Mike noted that doesn't help; the question now is why that number is so high.

Cindy Rovey indicated that Oak Creek Water's number is lower and Vice Chairman Bitz noted that originally it was 251. Chairman MacFarlane asked if we can account for all of the hotels, motels, etc., and Keith confirmed they are all separated out. Cindy Rovey noted that Arizona Water has more of the bigger houses, and although there isn't a lot of vegetation, the cost of water doesn't affect them as much, like houses in Foothills North or Bristlecone and Casa Contenta. There aren't as many of those kinds of houses in the Oak Creek Water area. Chairman MacFarlane pointed out that their area is older, smaller homes and Keith Self noted that area probably takes care of their own watering, where a lot of these other areas have landscapers controlling their irrigation.

Vice Chairman Bitz suggested putting a couple of comments in there on that point, not that there is a definitive answer, but as possible explanations for the difference, because anyone reading the report is going to assume that somebody is wrong, etc., so just something to say that it seems that these might be some of the reasons. Chairman MacFarlane cautioned that would get a lot of comments from people thinking they were being picked on.

Vice Chairman Bitz indicated that he has 1½ pages of comments, but in reviewing the report, he thinks the issues relating to a regional water policy are not adequately addressed in the report and it needs to be substantially rewritten to accommodate what is already known -- notably the CYHWRMS (Central Yavapai Highlands Water Resource Management Study) Phase I data. Chairman MacFarlane agreed that there has been a lot of data provided, so we need to be sure we incorporate it. Vice Chairman Bitz indicated that he would be happy to work with whomever, to assist in redrafting those portions to reflect the current facts.

The Vice Chairman asked if the Committee would like for him to work with Mike and Audree to redo this and Audree indicated it would be working with her. The Chairman indicated that sounds good, because we aren't at the point of some of this, but if it can be done ahead of time, it will be ready when staff is ready to incorporate it. Mike Raber explained that we are in the middle of doing our public community meetings and water issues haven't been prominent; we haven't heard many concerns expressed. Chairman MacFarlane added that part of the problem is that people don't have water on their minds. Mike pointed out that in the last update that was a big issue. Keith Self indicated that a wet winter eases people's minds too; they aren't thinking about drought. Mike recalled the last update was when we had a couple of outages, etc., but the point is that we haven't had to respond to any requests for information at this point; however, we are constantly trying to update all of this, so we can be ready to update that information.

The Chairman indicated that Vice Chairman Bitz can work with Audree on that and if anyone else is interested, let Audree know. Mike Raber added that he will get with Audree Juhlin on updating the tables, so we can total all of that. The Chairman thanked Mark Fenech and Keith Self for their help.

Mark Fenech indicated that they only have one other commercial build out that could be substantial and that is the airport, but it changes with the wind. There is a meeting today at 1:00 p.m. to get a clue as to where the wind is blowing today. The Chairman asked if that is about their new building and restaurant, etc., and Mark explained there is a lot of fire service that deals with water, but we

don't know if federal agencies will help fund it or if they are going to say they can't do it, so that could take some of our water, but until we see the types of buildings, etc., we don't know. Mike Raber added that they talked about a whole new terminal at one point, but they didn't get the grant. Keith Self indicated that they also had talked about sharing one between here and Cottonwood, but that hasn't been discussed recently. The Chairman indicated that she didn't think that would fly, no pun intended. Mark Fenech explained that in their build out, they have assumed it will be a certain amount and those assumptions were included in the numbers for 2015 and beyond.

No legal action was taken.

8. Discussion/possible action regarding plant list brochure

Beth Escobar distributed copies of a revised brochure and indicated that the revisions were received from Jean Searle, and to summarize, she had some objection to the word "desert", because we aren't technically in a desert environment, and she asked that the definition of native plants and adaptive plants be reworded, and then we had a discussion about the statement that most species are available at nurseries, because she said that is a little optimistic, so it was reworded to say, "Check local nurseries and gardening centers".

The Chairman noted that the Desert Marigold had been added and that was very nice. Beth also pointed out that Water Wise was put on the back; it is a little graphic intensive, so she would suggest not adding anything else. Chairman MacFarlane indicated that the pictures catch everybody's eye and she didn't think it is too much.

Cindy Rovey asked if the thought is to have it in this form and Beth indicated yes, on hard stock. Audree had some changes too, so we will just merge them and email you the final copy for final comments. We've actually entered the non-planting growing season, so if we have it up and running by the fall, it will be fine. Chairman MacFarlane agreed, because it will be too hot to plant.

Keith Self asked if we aren't high desert, what are we considered and Beth indicated it is Piñon, Juniper and grasslands. Chairman MacFarlane noted that Jean is a Botanist, so we need to defer to her. Beth summarized that she will email the combined edits to them and wait for their comments.

Beth indicated that she received Jean's edits for the plant list this morning and we are going to format it with the scientific name first and do it portrait, and in P&Z we discussed switching the names around like instead of Locust, New Mexico it would be New Mexico Locust, so we are going to do that, but she wanted to make sure that the Committee supported that too and Chairman MacFarlane indicated yes. Beth indicated that there was also one question on the adaptive shrubs; we have the Firethorn *Pyracantha* and that was also added to the unacceptable groundcover, and she wasn't sure if that was because we didn't want to see it as a groundcover or if that was an error. As a groundcover, it can grow 2 ft. high and 10 ft. wide. The Chairman indicated that the height and width are probably why it was listed; it would be great for a fence, because it is sticky, but that is probably not what we want, so leave it there.

Beth explained that she hopes to have everything collated and to Jean one more time by next week, and then possibly to Council in the second meeting in June or first of July. Chairman MacFarlane noted that it looks a lot easier to read and understand than our previous one. It doesn't have to be pretty; we want it to be serviceable. Beth noted that it is also now searchable, since it is in an Excel spreadsheet, so when we have the final copy and put it on the website, you can do the find feature, which will make it much more user-friendly. Chairman MacFarlane indicated that sounds great and

thanked Beth for all of her work on that. Beth added that she also thanked Jean on behalf of the Committee.

No legal action was taken.

9. Discussion/possible action regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items

Audree indicated the Committee is scheduled to meet on September 9th and Chairman MacFarlane agreed that we should go ahead and schedule that meeting, because we don't know what the incoming Council will decide to do, so everyone should consider continuing on the Committee and meeting in September; however, this is her last meeting. She is resigning as of the end of this month, because she has a lot of other things she needs to do; she has been working on City stuff for a long time, so she will finish up with WEDLU, and then she is going to go play. The Chairman thanked all of the members for their hard work and wished them well, and the members thanked Anita for her excellent leadership. Chairman MacFarlane added that if the Council decides to roll the Committee into something else, the one thing that she will ask them to do is to ensure that they continue the Water Wise Day. We have a good hold on how we do that now, and if they put it under the Environmental Committee, it is still something they should plan on doing.

10. Adjournment

The Chairman called for adjournment at 11:03 a.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Water Conservation Advisory Committee held on May 13, 2010.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date